

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 and 21 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6, 7, 14-18 and 21 have been amended. Claim 20 was canceled by a previous amendment. Claims 1 and 21 are independent. Claims 7-19 stand withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner as being directed to a non-elected invention.

Interview with Examiner

Several telephone interviews were conducted with the Examiner in charge of the above-identified application between June 19, 2006 and June 22, 2006. Applicant's representative appreciates the courtesy shown by the Examiner during the interviews.

In the Interviews with the Examiner, the Examiner indicated that claim 1 as presented in the Supplemental Amendment dated April 24, 2006 did not appear to be supported by the original disclosure, since the transport apparatus does not include guide channels. It was explained to the Examiner that the alignment section includes guide channels 66, for example. The Examiner suggested that claim 1 be amended to clarify this point.

In view of the above, with regard to independent claim 1, this claim has been amended to recite the alignment section as being an element of the stacking apparatus and the transport apparatus as including a transport section. Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is clearly supported by the original disclosure.

In the interview with the Examiner, the Examiner also indicated that claim 6 appeared to be directed to allowable subject matter if amended to clarify between the alignment section and the transport section. Claim 1 has been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner. In

addition, claim 1 has been amended to include part of the subject matter of dependent claim 6. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to include the transport section previously recited in dependent claim 6. Applicants submit that amended independent claim 1 defines the present invention over the Muylle reference relied on by the Examiner. Therefore, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-19 and 20 should be in condition for allowance.

Finally, in the interview with the Examiner, the Examiner indicated that claim 21 appeared to be allowable if amended to clarify between the transport section and the transfer section. By the present amendment, claim 21 has been amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, claim 21 should be in condition for allowance.

Favorable consideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Paul C. Lewis, Registration No. 43,368 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Dated: June 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By

Marc S. Weiner

Registration No.: 32,181

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant